

OPEN MEETING ITEM

COMMISSIONERS
KRISTIN K. MAYES - Chairman
GARY PIERCE
PAUL NEWMAN
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
BOB STUMP

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION



0000116095

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

SEP 2 2010

DATE: SEPTEMBER 2, 2010
DOCKET NOS.: W-01431A-09-0360 AND W-01431A-09-0361

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Belinda A. Martin. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Opinion and Order on:

THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM F. RANDALL
D/B/A VALLE VERDE WATER COMPANY
(RATES/FINANCING)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by **4:00** p.m. on or before:

SEPTEMBER 13, 2010

The enclosed is NOT an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has tentatively been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

SEPTEMBER 21, 2010 AND SEPTEMBER 22, 2010

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602) 542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602) 542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Director's Office at (602) 542-3931.

RECEIVED
2010 SEP -2 P 3:33
AZCC COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

ERNEST G. JOHNSON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET; PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2927 / 400 WEST CONGRESS STREET; TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1347
WWW.AZCC.GOV

This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Shaylin Bernal, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, E-mail SABernal@azcc.gov

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 **COMMISSIONERS**

3 KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman
4 GARY PIERCE
5 PAUL NEWMAN
6 SANDRA D. KENNEDY
7 BOB STUMP

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
9 THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM F. RANDALL D/B/A
10 VALLE VERDE WATER COMPANY FOR AN
11 INCREASE IN ITS WATER RATES.

DOCKET NO. W-01431A-09-0360

12 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
13 THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM F. RANDALL D/B/A
14 VALLE VERDE WATER COMPANY FOR
15 AUTHORITY TO INCUR LONG-TERM DEBT.

DOCKET NO. W-01431A-09-0361

DECISION NO. _____

16 **OPINION AND ORDER**

17 DATE OF HEARING: April 22, 2010

18 PLACE OF HEARING: Tucson, Arizona

19 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Belinda A. Martin

20 APPEARANCES: Mr. Steve Wene, MOYES SELLERS & SIMS, on
21 behalf of the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle
22 Verde Water Company; and

23 Ms. Kimberly A. Ruht and Ms. Ayesha Vohra, Staff
24 Attorneys, Legal Division, on behalf of the Utilities
25 Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission.

26 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

27 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

28 On July 17, 2009, Southwestern Utility Management, Inc., ("SUM") interim manager of
William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water Company ("Valle Verde" or "Company") filed with the
Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application on behalf of Valle Verde for an
increase in the Company's water rates ("Rate Application"). Also on July 17, 2009, SUM filed an
application on behalf of Valle Verde for authority to incur long-term debt ("Finance Application").

On July 24, 2009, SUM filed an Affidavit of Mailing, averring that it had mailed notice of the
Rate Application to all Valle Verde customers by U.S. Mail on July 17, 2009.

1 On July 29, 2009, SUM filed an Affidavit of Mailing, averring that it had mailed notice of the
2 Finance Application to Valle Verde customers by U.S. Mail on July 27, 2009.

3 On August 14, 2009, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Letter of
4 Deficiency indicating that the Rate Application was not sufficient pursuant to the Arizona
5 Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-103.

6 On September 11, 2009, SUM filed a Response to Staff's Deficiency Letter.

7 On September 29, 2009, Staff filed its Letter of Sufficiency in the Rate Application docket,
8 classifying Valle Verde as a Class 'C' public water utility.

9 On October 1, 2009, Staff filed Motions for Consolidation in both the Rate Application
10 docket and the Finance Application docket.

11 On October 5, 2009, a Procedural Order was issued setting the hearing in the Rate Application
12 for April 22, 2010, and establishing other procedural deadlines.

13 On October 13, 2009, a Procedural Order was issued consolidating the Rate Application
14 docket and the Finance Application docket.

15 On November 5, 2009, SUM filed an Affidavit averring that it had mailed a copy of the
16 Notice of Hearing to its customers on November 4, 2009, and published the Notice of Hearing in the
17 *Nogales International* on November 3, 2009. In response to the Notice, the Commission received
18 numerous customer comments, all opposed to the rate increase requested in the Rate Application.

19 On February 11, 2010, Staff filed the Direct Testimony of Pedro Chaves and Dorothy Hains.

20 On March 12, 2010, SUM filed the Rebuttal Testimony of Bonnie O'Connor, Sonn Rowell
21 and Greg Carlson.

22 On April 1, 2010, Staff filed the Surrebuttal Testimony of Pedro Chaves and Dorothy Hains.

23 On April 12, 2010, SUM filed the Rejoinder of Sonn Rowell.

24 On April 22, 2010, the hearing on these matters was held as scheduled. The parties appeared
25 through counsel before a duly authorized administrative law judge. At the conclusion of the hearing,
26 the dockets were held open pending the submission of certain late-filed exhibits and closing briefs.
27 Because of the briefing schedule, the timeclock in this matter was extended.

28 On May 19, 2010, a Procedural Order was filed directing SUM to publish notice of a Public

1 Comment Meeting to be held on June 2, 2010, in Nogales, Arizona.

2 On May 27, 2010, SUM filed a Post-Hearing Brief.

3 On June 2, 2010, a Public Comment Meeting was held as directed in the May 19, 2010,
4 Procedural Order. Members of the Public appeared and provided comment.

5 On June 10, 2010, SUM filed the Post-Hearing Testimony of Bonnie O'Connor.

6 On June 24, 2010, Staff filed a Request for Extension of time to file its Responsive Brief.

7 On June 28, 2010, a Procedural Order was filed granting Staff's Request for Extension.

8 On June 29, 2010, Staff filed its Responsive Brief and Final Schedules.

9 On July 15, 2010, SUM filed a Post-Hearing Reply Brief.

10 On August 9, 2010, SUM filed a Motion to Include Emergency Repairs Within Scope of
11 Projects Set Forth in Finance Application.

12 On August 16, 2010, Staff filed its Response to the Motion.

13 * * * * *

14 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
15 Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

16 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

17 **BACKGROUND**

18 1. Valle Verde is an Arizona Class 'C' public water utility engaged in the business of
19 providing potable water service to approximately 800 customers near the City of Nogales, Arizona, in
20 Santa Cruz County. The Commission granted Valle Verde a Certificate of Convenience and
21 Necessity in Decision No. 28887 (April 27, 1955). Valle Verde's current permanent rates and
22 charges were set by Decision No. 59553 (March 13, 1996).

23 2. Valle Verde is currently owned by the Estate of William F. Randall, who had operated
24 the system for many years prior to his death.¹ Upon Mr. Randall's death, the system fell into
25 financial and operational disarray and became non-compliant with several Arizona Department of
26 Environmental Quality ("ADEQ") Rules.

27 _____
28 ¹ SUM witness Bonnie O'Connor testified that the ownership status has not changed since SUM became the interim manager. Tr. at 18.

3. On August 29, 2007, the Commission issued Decision No. 69882, an Order to Show Cause, ordering Valle Verde to answer allegations concerning the violation of Commission Rules and directing Staff to appoint an interim manger to operate the system. The Commission entered into an agreement with SUM to act as the interim manager of Valle Verde. SUM has been operating the system as interim manager, pursuant to an agreement with the Commission, since September 2007.

4. On September 27, 2007, SUM filed an application with the Commission for emergency rate relief and for authority to access the small water system fund administered by the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (“WIFA”) pursuant to A.R.S. § 49-355.

5. In Decision No. 70098 (December 21, 2007), the Commission granted an emergency interim surcharge of \$1.73 per 1,000 gallons in order to keep the system operating, make necessary repairs and to remediate problems the system was experiencing with volatile organic compounds (“VOCs”). The Decision noted that if there were any funds remaining after necessary repairs and correcting the water quality problems, the Company could apply those funds to paying down any outstanding accounts payable. The Decision also directed SUM to file an application for a permanent rate increase by April 30, 2009. Decision No. 71175 (June 30, 2009) granted SUM an extension for filing of the rate application until July 17, 2009. SUM filed the instant Rate Application on July 17, 2009. Upon approval of Valle Verde’s permanent rates, the emergency interim surcharge will no longer be collected.

RATE APPLICATION

6. During the test year ending December 31, 2008 (“Test Year”), Valle Verde provided water utility service to approximately 800 customers.

7. SUM proposes that the Commission adopt rates that would result in an overall increase in revenues of 109.31 percent. Staff recommends a revenue increase of 103.04 percent. A summary of the parties' final revenue requirement positions follows:²

• • •

• • •

² Staff's Responsive Brief, Final Schedule PMC-1.

	<u>Company Proposed</u>	<u>Staff Proposed</u>
1 ORIGINAL COST		
2 Fair Value Rate Base	\$ 517,840	\$ (593,061)
3 Adjusted Operating Inc.	(301,837)	(225,970)
4 Current Rate of Return	-58.29%	Not Meaningful
Required Rate of Return	Not Used	Not Meaningful
5 Rec. Operating Margin	20.56%	10.09%
Req'd Operating Income	195,915	56,687
6 Rec. Operating Inc.	497,753	282,657
7 Rev. Conver. Factor	1.0000	1.0086
Rec. Op. Rev. Inc.	497,753	285,075
8 Adjusted TY Rev.	455,348	276,656
Rec. Ann. Op. Rev	953,101	561,730
9 Req'd Inc. in Rev. (%)	109.31%	103.04%
10 Rate of Return	37.83%	Not Meaningful

11 8. Staff's adjustment to the Company's proposed fair value rate base ("FVRB"), which is
 12 the same as its original cost rate base, included the removal by Staff of \$1,063,478 of plant that has
 13 yet to be constructed, Staff's disallowance of \$52,205 in working capital, and the addition of
 14 reclassified plant in the amount of \$4,782.³ Staff's adjustments result in a recommended negative
 15 FVRB of (\$593,061), a \$1,120,465 decrease to the Company's proposed FVRB of \$517,840.

16 9. Staff's recommended FVRB is reasonable and shall be adopted.

17 10. Much of the remaining difference between SUM's and Staff's calculations relate to
 18 disagreements regarding the treatment of depreciation expense in calculating cash flow and debt
 19 service, and Staff's property tax calculation.

20 Depreciation Expense and Cash Flow

21 11. Staff recommends adjusted operating revenues of \$561,730 and adjusted operating
 22 expenses of \$505,043, for a total recommended operating income of \$56,687. Included in Staff's
 23 recommended operating expenses is an adjusted depreciation expense of \$112,113.⁴

24 12. To calculate Valle Verde's *pro forma* cash flow, including the debt service for the
 25 WIFA loan,⁵ Staff began with the \$56,687 operating income, added the depreciation expense of

27 ³ Staff's Responsive Brief, Final Schedule PMC-3.

28 ⁴ Staff's Responsive Brief, Final Schedule PMC-6.

⁵ See the Finance Application section herein for a discussion of the WIFA loan.

1 \$112,113, and then backed out advance refunds and debt service. This calculation resulted in a *pro*
2 *forma* cash flow for the Company of \$71,709 for any contingencies the Company may have.⁶

3 13. Valle Verde objects to Staff's inclusion of depreciation expense in the *pro forma* cash
4 flow calculations. The Company states that, "Staff first includes the revenue from depreciation to
5 cover operating expenses, and then it later includes that same revenue from depreciation to service
6 debt."⁷ The Company asserts that the result of this "double-counting" will result in it having very
7 little income to make unanticipated capital repairs.

8 14. Staff responds that Valle Verde is not accurately reflecting Staff's position. "The
9 [Company's] assertion fails to recognize that depreciation is appropriately included as an operating
10 expense in the income statement and as a reconciling item for calculating cash flow when using
11 operating income as the starting amount."⁸ Staff explains:

12
13 Staff's recommended revenues provide for recovery of all operating expenses, including
14 depreciation expense. Staff's Final Schedule PMC-6. An operating income, as opposed
15 to an operating loss, demonstrates that Staff's recommended revenue provides for
16 recovery of depreciation expense as well as all other operating expenses. Unlike an
17 operating income statement, a cash flow analysis simply shows the sources and uses of
18 cash. Thus, non-operating items that are a source or use of cash such as principal and
interest payments on debt service are included and non-cash items such as depreciation
expense are excluded. Staff's Final Schedule PMC-6 provides a calculation of net cash
flows showing that Staff-recommended revenues generate a \$71,709 positive net cash
flow. This represents the amount of contingent cash generated annually after all cash
obligations have been paid.⁹

19 15. In other words, because depreciation is non-cash, non-operating revenue, Staff asserts
20 it is correct to include depreciation when determining what cash is available for payment of various
21 obligations such as debt service. Staff asserts that it "is a common practice in the financial world,"
22 and notes that Staff confirmed with WIFA that it, too, "includes depreciation expense in the
23 numerator when calculating debt service."¹⁰

24 16. We agree with Staff's position and adopt Staff's treatment of the depreciation expense
25 for cash flow and debt service calculations.

26 ⁶ Staff's Responsive Brief, Final Schedule PMC-6.

27 ⁷ Valle Verde's Post-Hearing Brief, page 2.

28 ⁸ Staff's Responsive Brief, page 3.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Tr. at 161-163.

1 **Property Tax Calculation**

2 17. During the Test Year, Valle Verde paid property taxes of \$14,129 and requests that the
3 Commission adopt this amount as its property tax expense going forward.

4 18. Staff recommends decreasing the property tax expense from \$14,129 to \$9,108, a
5 decrease of \$5,021. "Staff used a modification of the Arizona Department of Revenue ("ADOR")
6 method to calculate Valle Verde's property tax expense, which is the methodology typically
7 employed by Staff."¹¹ Using ADOR's formula, Staff calculated the Company's property tax as
8 \$6,690; however, for ratemaking purposes Staff increased that amount to \$9,108 to allow for the
9 prospective component of Staff's methodology.¹²

10 19. Staff states that the Company's request to allow the amount of taxes paid during the
11 Test Year as the property tax expense is not an accurate method of determining property taxes for
12 future years. In its Responsive Brief Staff notes:

13
14 Even though Staff utilized the method employed by ADOR, the Company takes issue
15 with Staff's calculation and recommendation because it is different than Valle Verde's.
16 The Company proposes a property tax expense based on the amount paid during the test
17 year, but that number is inconsistent with, and significantly higher than, Staff's
18 calculation. This suggests that Valle Verde's taxes were not appropriately assessed, to
the Company's detriment. However, Staff does not believe it is reasonable for the
Company to overpay on its taxes and then be allowed to pass that burden on to the
ratepayers. Tr. at 148:16-20. It is the Company's responsibility, not the ratepayers'
responsibility, to properly manage the Company's expenses.¹³

19 20. Using Staff's methodology adopted from the ADOR property tax formula, Staff
20 believes that Valle Verde has overpaid its property tax and should have challenged the tax
21 assessment.¹⁴

22 21. The Company asserts that Staff's calculations of prospective property taxes are
23 speculative, as is Staff's assertion that the Company overpaid its taxes in the past. Valle Verde
24 further notes that with the rate increase, the property taxes will likely also increase. As such, the
25

26
27 ¹¹ Staff's Responsive Brief, page 4.

28 ¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ Tr. at 171-174

1 Company believes its approach is the more reasonable one going forward.¹⁵

2 22. Staff states that "the Company's methodology does not address or remedy why the
3 Company paid significantly more property tax during the Test Year than would be expected using
4 ADOR's method and the same inputs."¹⁶

5 23. The Company did not explain why its property tax expense was higher than
6 calculated using the ADOR property tax formula and did not submit sufficient evidence that Staff's
7 use of the modified ADOR method for calculating property tax in analyzing rate cases is incorrect or
8 inadequate. Staff's recommendation is reasonable and shall be adopted.

9 **Revenue Requirement**

10 24. Based on the foregoing, we adopt Staff's recommended revenue requirement of
11 \$561,730, which, after adjusted operating expenses of \$503,043, results in operating income of
12 \$56,687.

13 **Rate Design**

14 25. Set forth below are the current, Company proposed, and Staff proposed rates and
15 charges according their respective revenue requirement and rate design recommendations.¹⁷

	Present Rates	Company Proposed	Staff Recommended
17 <u>MONTHLY USAGE CHARGES:</u>			
18 5/8" x 3/4" Meter (All Classes)	\$11.75	\$30.00	\$18.00
19 3/4" Meter (All Classes)	11.90	45.00	18.00
20 1" Meter (All Classes)	20.00	75.00	43.00
21 1-1/2" Meter (All Classes)	31.00	150.00	86.00
22 2" Meter (All Classes)	59.65	240.00	138.00
23 3" Meter (All Classes)	120.00	480.00	275.00
24 4" Meter (All Classes)	250.00	750.00	429.00
25 6" Meter (All Classes)	500.00	1,500.00	857.00

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

¹⁵ Valle Verde Post-Hearing Brief, pages 7-8. According to Valle Verde's Final Schedule E-8, it paid \$14,831 in property taxes in 2006, \$15,718 in 2007, and \$14,129 in 2008.

¹⁶ Staff's Responsive Brief, pages 4-5.

¹⁷ Staff's Responsive Brief, Final Schedule PMC-14.

COMMODITY CHARGES:**(Per 1,000 Gallons)****5/8 x 3/4-Inch Meter (Residential)**

0 to 8,000 Gallons	\$1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A	\$3.00	\$1.30
3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

3/4-Inch Meter (Residential)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A	3.00	1.30
3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

5/8 x 3/4-Inch Meter (Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A	3.00	N/A
3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	N/A
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	N/A
0 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	N/A	2.90
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	N/A	4.25

3/4-Inch Meter (Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 3,000 Gallons	N/A	3.00	N/A
3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	N/A
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	N/A
0 to 10,000 Gallons	N/A	N/A	2.90
Over 10,000 Gallons	N/A	N/A	4.25

1-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 15,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 15,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

1 1/2 -Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 20,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 20,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

2-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial, Res/Comm.)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 25,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 25,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

3-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 70,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 70,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

4-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 150,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 150,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

6-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 8,000 Gallons	1.30	N/A	N/A
Over 8,000 Gallons	1.47	N/A	N/A
0 to 500,000 Gallons	N/A	4.50	2.90
Over 500,000 Gallons	N/A	5.65	4.25

SERVICE LINE AND METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:

	<u>Present</u>		<u>Company Proposed</u>		<u>Staff Recommended</u>		
	Total	Service Line	Meter Installation	Total	Service Line	Meter Installation	Total
5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 320.00	\$ 445.00	\$ 155.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 445.00	\$ 155.00	\$ 600.00
3/4" " Meter	360.00	445.00	255.00	700.00	445.00	255.00	700.00
1" Meter	420.00	495.00	315.00	810.00	495.00	315.00	810.00
1-1/2" Meter	635.00	550.00	525.00	1,075.00	550.00	525.00	1,075.00

1	2" Turbine Meter	1,090.00	830.00	1,045.00	1,875.00	830.00	1,045.00	1,875.00
	2" Compound Meter	N/T	830.00	1,890.00	2,720.00	830.00	1,890.00	2,720.00
2	3" Turbine Meter	1,505.00	1,045.00	1,870.00	2,715.00	1,045.00	1,870.00	2,715.00
	3" Compound Meter	N/T	1,165.00	2,545.00	3,710.00	1,165.00	2,545.00	3,710.00
3	4" Turbine Meter	2,380.00	1,490.00	1,737.00	3,227.00	1,490.00	1,737.00	3,227.00
	4" Compound Meter	N/T	1,670.00	3,645.00	5,315.00	1,670.00	3,645.00	5,315.00
4	6" Turbine Meter	4,655.00	2,210.00	3,766.00	5,976.00	2,210.00	3,766.00	5,976.00
	6" Compound Meter	N/T	2,330.00	6,920.00	9,250.00	2,330.00	6,920.00	9,250.00
5	Over 6"	N/T	N/T	N/T	N/T	Cost	Cost	Cost

SERVICE CHARGES:

<u>SERVICE CHARGES.</u>		Present Rates	Company Proposed	Staff Recommended
8				
9	Establishment	\$10.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
	Establishment (After Hours)	20.00	40.00	40.00
10	Reconnection (Delinquent)	20.00	40.00	40.00
	Reconnection (Delinquent and After Hours)	N/T	50.00	50.00
11	Meter Test (if correct)	35.00	35.00	35.00
	Deposit	(a)	(a)	(a)
12	Deposit Interest	(a)	(a)	(a)
	Re-Establishment (Within 12 Months)	(b)	(b)	(b)
13	NSF Check	\$15.00	\$30.00	\$25.00
14	Late Charge per month	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
	Deferred Payment, Per Month	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
15	Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	10.00	20.00	20.00
16	Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler	(c)	(c)	(d)

N/T = No Tariff

(a) Per Commission Rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)

(b) Number of months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission Rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D).

(c) 1% of monthly minimum for a comparable sized meter connection, but no less than \$5.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

(d) 2% of monthly minimum for a comparable sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

26. For a residential customer served by a 5/8-inch meter with average usage of 7,550 gallons per month, the current monthly charges are \$21.57. Under the Company's proposed rates, a customer with the same average usage would experience an increase of \$37.91 per month, or 175.79 percent, to \$59.48. For a residential customer with a median usage of 5,658 gallons per month, the current monthly charges are \$19.11. The Company's proposal would increase this current monthly bill by \$31.86, or 166.74 percent, to \$50.97.

27. For a residential customer served by a 3/4-inch meter with average usage of 7,433 gallons per month, the current monthly charges are \$21.56. Under the Company's proposed rates, a customer with the same average usage would experience an increase of \$52.39 per month, or 242.94 percent, to \$73.95. For a residential customer with a median usage of 5,480 gallons per month, the current monthly charges are \$19.02. The Company's proposal would increase this current monthly bill by \$46.14, or 242.51 percent, to \$65.16.

28. An average usage customer on a 5/8-inch meter under Staff's recommended rates would experience an increase of \$13.53 per month, or 62.74 percent, to \$35.10. Staff's recommendation would increase the median usage customer's monthly bill by \$10.50, or 54.97 percent, to \$29.61.

29. An average usage customer on a 3/4-inch meter under Staff's recommended rates would experience an increase of \$13.19 per month, or 61.17 percent, to \$34.75. Staff's recommendation would increase the median usage customer's monthly bill by \$10.07, or 52.91 percent, to \$29.09.

30. Based upon our adoption of Staff's revenue requirement, we will adopt Staff's proposed rate design.

Temporary Surcharge

31. In the Rate Application, SUM listed a purchased water expense of \$187,158 for water the Company had to purchase from the City of Nogales due to a number of problems with the wells. SUM noted that the rates the Company had to pay the City for the water exceeded what the Company could charge its customers, thereby causing Valle Verde to incur substantial debt.¹⁸ SUM ceased purchasing water from the City in November or December of 2008.¹⁹ SUM made payments on the account as it could, and as of May 21, 2010, the balance on the account was \$95,707.84.²⁰

32. Staff disallowed the purchased water expense for the purpose of determining permanent rates because it is not an expense for the Company going forward. SUM understood

¹⁸ Bonnie O'Connor testified that she approached the City of Nogales and asked for a reduced water rate given the Company's dire financial and operational circumstances, but the City did not grant a discount. Ms. O'Connor testified that the City's rate was approximately \$2.53 and the Company's rate is \$1.30. Tr. at 15.

¹⁹ Tr. at 29.

²⁰ Valle Verde's Post-Hearing Brief, Final Schedule C-2c.

1 Staff's reasoning, but asserted that some means of cash flow is necessary to repay the debt.

2 33. As such, SUM proposed a temporary surcharge ("Temporary Surcharge") to be used
3 solely for the purpose of paying off the remaining balance owed to the City of Nogales for purchased
4 water. SUM proposed a surcharge amount of \$5.62 per month, per customer.²¹

5 34. At hearing, SUM proposed revising the calculations from a flat fee to a volumetric
6 charge. According to SUM, this would result in customers who use more water sharing a more
7 proportional cost in repaying the City.²² Under SUM's proposed volumetric charge, customers would
8 be charged \$.60 per 1,000 gallons.²³ A customer on a 5/8-inch meter having average water usage of
9 7,550 would have a surcharge of approximately \$4.53. A customer on a 5/8-inch meter having
10 median water usage of 5,658 would have a surcharge of approximately \$3.39. The funds generated
11 by this surcharge will be a dedicated revenue stream. SUM estimates that the surcharge will be
12 necessary for approximately 18 months, depending upon the amount that is owed at the time the
13 surcharge is implemented. Upon payment in full of the account, the surcharge will cease.²⁴

14 35. Staff does not object to the temporary surcharge and believes a volumetric surcharge is
15 more appropriate than a flat fee.²⁵ Staff recommends that the Company be ordered to file notice with
16 the Commission when the debt to the City has been paid and SUM is no longer collecting the
17 surcharge.²⁶ Staff's recommendation is reasonable and shall be adopted.

18 36. We believe it is also reasonable to require the Company to file quarterly statements
19 with the Commission regarding the status of the account.

20 FINANCE APPLICATION

21 37. SUM's Financing Application requested Commission approval to obtain a \$1,063,478
22 loan from WIFA for a term of 20 to 30 years. The funds from the loan will be used to repair and
23 replace water distribution mains, interconnect wells, install an arsenic treatment system, abandon
24 wells contaminated with VOCs, relocate water distribution lines into the public right-of-way, replace

25 _____
26 ²¹ Surrebuttal Testimony of Sonn Rowell, pages 5-6 and Surrebuttal Schedule C-2c.

²² Tr. at 62-63.

27 ²³ Valle Verde Post-Hearing Brief, Final Schedule C-2c.

²⁴ Valle Verde Post-Hearing Brief, pages 5-6.

28 ²⁵ Tr. at 146-147, 179.

²⁶ Staff's Responsive Brief, page 4.

1 water meters, install fire hydrant locks and make other related improvements.

2 38. SUM anticipates paying a fixed interest rate of prime plus two percent multiplied by a
3 subsidy rate index set by WIFA. According to the Finance Application, WIFA may offer the
4 Company an 85 percent subsidy rate such that the effective interest rate could be prime plus two
5 percent x 85 percent.

6 39. Staff reviewed the projects proposed in the Financing Application and determined the
7 projects are appropriate and the cost estimates projected by the Company are reasonable. Staff made
8 no "used and useful" determination of the proposed plant and no particular future treatment should be
9 inferred for rate-making or rate base purposes.

10 40. During Staff's review of Valle Verde's water systems, Staff found that one of the
11 Company's well systems, PWS No. 12-009, does not currently have any storage capacity and the
12 Company did not propose in its Finance Application to install storage capacity as part of its
13 improvements. As such, Staff recommends that a minimum of 175,000 gallons of storage capacity be
14 installed prior to December 2011. Staff further recommends that a copy of the Approval of
15 Construction for the additional storage be docketed as a compliance item in this matter no later than
16 December 31, 2011.²⁷

17 41. In response to Staff's recommendation, the Company increased its financing request
18 from \$1,063,478 to \$1,313,938 to include an estimated construction cost of \$250,460 for the
19 additional storage recommended by Staff.

20 42. Engineering Staff reviewed the proposed cost of the additional storage construction
21 and found that certain equipment included by the Company in its cost estimates was not necessary
22 and Staff estimated the cost of constructing the 175,000 gallon storage tank at approximately
23 \$214,760.²⁸ As a result, the amount of the WIFA loan recommended by Staff for approval by the
24 Commission is \$1,278,238.²⁹

25 43. Staff examined the effects of the proposed financing on Valle Verde's debt service
26

27 ²⁷ Exhibit S-1, Direct Testimony of Dorothy Hains, DMH-1, page 4.

28 ²⁸ Exhibit S-2, Surrebuttal Testimony of Dorothy Hains, pages 3-4.

28 ²⁹ Exhibit S-4, Surrebuttal Testimony of Pedro Chaves, page 3.

1 coverage ("DSC").³⁰ Using Staff's recommended revenue requirement and fully drawing the
2 proposed \$1,278,238 loan results in *pro forma* DSC 1.74. This ratio shows that Valle Verde would
3 have adequate cash flow to meet all obligations, including the proposed debt.

4 44. Staff concludes that the proposed WIFA loan is an appropriate financial instrument to
5 finance the proposed plans. Staff further concludes that issuance of a long-term amortizing loan of
6 approximately 18 to 22 years for the \$1,278,238 estimated cost of the capital improvements is
7 appropriate, is within its corporate powers, is compatible with the public interest, would not impair its
8 ability to provide services and would be consistent with sound financial practices.

9 45. Staff recommends Commission authorization for Valle Verde to obtain an 18-to-22
10 year amortizing loan at a rate not to exceed the prime rate plus two percent for an amount not to
11 exceed \$1,278,238 to finance the improvements.

12 46. On August 9, 2010, SUM filed a Motion to Include Emergency Repairs Within Scope
13 of Projects Set Forth in Finance Application. According to the Motion, the Company recently
14 discovered a substantial leak in a 4-inch mainline located two feet from the edge of a main
15 thoroughfare. Although the line has been temporarily repaired, SUM believes that the line must
16 immediately be isolated and taken out of service. In order to fund this project, which SUM estimates
17 will cost approximately \$25,000, SUM will enter into a short-term agreement loan with Valle Verde.
18 SUM requests that this project be included as an authorized project under its Finance Application and
19 asks the Commission to permit Valle Verde to use the WIFA loan proceeds to repay SUM's short-
20 term loan. SUM states that it is not requesting an increase in the amount of financing; it only seeks
21 authority to use funds from the WIFA proceeds for the repayment of the short-term loan.

22 47. In Staff's Response to the Motion, Staff stated that they have no objection to the
23 Company requests, but suggests that it would be beneficial to keep this docket open for at least
24 twelve months. Staff's reasoning is that, in the event that other emergency circumstances arise that
25 may prevent the Company from repaying SUM's short-term loan within twelve months, conversion
26 of the loan from short-term debt into long-term debt could be accomplished without the need for an

27
28 ³⁰ DSC represents the number of times internally generated cash cover required principal and interest payments on debt.
A DSC greater than 1.0 means operating cash flow is sufficient to cover debt obligations.

1 entirely new application.³¹

2 48. Staff's recommendations are reasonable and shall be adopted.

3 49. We believe it reasonable to allow SUM to engage in any transaction and to execute
4 any documents necessary to effectuate the permitted authorization.

5 50. Further, it is reasonable to require SUM to file with Docket Control, as a compliance
6 item in this docket, copies of the executed financing documents with 60 days after the transaction is
7 closed.

8 **Unauthorized Truck Loan**

9 51. During the review of the Rate and Finance Application, Staff became aware of an
10 unauthorized debt issuance. According to Staff, on February 25, 2008, Valle Verde obtained a
11 \$15,238, 60-month, 7.14 percent loan from Citizens Automobile Finance to acquire a truck. The
12 current balance of the loan is approximately \$9,800.³²

13 52. According to Ms. O'Connor, when SUM took over management of the Company, they
14 found that Valle Verde did not own any transportation equipment. Employees of the Company used
15 their personal vehicles and then the Company reimbursed them for their expenses. After the
16 employees left or were terminated, Valle Verde had no vehicles for employees to use and it became
17 necessary for the Company to purchase a truck as quickly as possible for employee use. Ms.
18 O'Connor testified that she is fully aware that a public utility must obtain Commission approval
19 before acquiring long-term debt, but in this circumstance it was necessary to the Company's
20 operations to purchase a truck quickly.³³

21 53. Staff recommends that the Company should request Commission authorization for the
22 truck loan in accordance with A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.

23 54. Staff's recommendation is reasonable and shall be adopted. SUM should file a
24 finance application on behalf of Valle Verde for approval of the truck loan no later than January 31,
25 2011.

26 _____
27 ³¹ Staff's Reply to the Company's Motion to Include Emergency Repairs Within Scope of Projects Set Forth in Finance
Application, page 2.

28 ³² Exhibit S-4, Surrebuttal Testimony of Pedro Chavez, page 4.

³³ Tr. at 24. Ms. O'Connor also stated that SUM donated two vehicles to Valle Verde.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

1
2 55. Valle Verde owns and operates two water systems; PWS 12-009 and PWS 12-025.
3 According to Staff, PWS No. 12-009 consists of two wells that have 530 gallons per minute ("gpm")
4 combined capacity, one 500 gpm tetrachloroethylene ("PCE") removal plant, two pressure tanks and
5 a distribution system serving approximately 730 metered customers. This system is interconnected to
6 the City of Nogales water system and was used by the Company for the provision of water to its
7 customers during the construction of the PCE removal plant. Due to the PCE contamination, Well
8 Nos. 1, 4, 7 and 8 have been abandoned. As noted earlier, this system does not have any storage, and
9 Staff recommends construction of a 175,000 gallon storage tank.

10 56. PWS No. 12-025 consists of three wells that have 1,350 gpm combined capacity,
11 1,000,000 gallon storage capacity, two booster pump stations, two pressure tanks and a distribution
12 system serving approximately 90 metered customers. Arsenic levels in Well Nos. 5 and 6 exceed the
13 arsenic standard. The Company will use proceeds from the WIFA loan to construct an arsenic
14 treatment plant. Staff states that this system has adequate storage and production capacities.

15 57. In the Engineering Report attached to the Direct Testimony of Dorothy Hains, Staff
16 stated that PWS No. 12-009 reported a water loss of 21.7 percent during the Test Year, exceeding
17 Staff's recommended 10 percent threshold. Staff stated that the Company attributed the excessive
18 water loss to leakage from a 12-inch main during the Test Year, which was repaired in 2009. Water
19 loss data through October 2009 indicates that the water loss for the system had been reduced to two
20 percent. Staff recommended that the Company monitor this system and report the water loss in its
21 Annual Report.³⁴

22 58. Ms. Hains stated that during the Test Year the Company reported a water loss of five
23 percent for PWS 12-025, which is with acceptable limits.³⁵

24 59. During hearing, Ms. Hains testified that after the preparation of her Direct Testimony,
25 Staff learned from the Company's 2009 Annual Report that, although PWS 12-009 reported a
26 substantial decrease in water loss, PWS 12-025 reported an increase in water loss to 21 percent in
27

28 ³⁴ Exhibit S-1, Direct Testimony of Dorothy Hains, Attachment DMH-1, page 7.

³⁵ *Id.*

1 2009. Because of the large variances in water loss in both systems, Ms. Hains revised Staff's
2 recommendation. Staff now recommends that Valle Verde monitor the water loss for both systems
3 and report the losses in its Annual Reports. If the combined reported water loss is greater than 10
4 percent, the Company shall prepare a report containing a detailed analysis and plan to reduce water
5 loss to 10 percent or less. If the Company believes it is not cost effective to reduce the water loss to
6 less than 10 percent, it should submit a detailed cost benefit analysis to support its opinion. In no case
7 shall the Company allow water loss to be greater than 15 percent.³⁶

8 60. Staff recommends that the Company use the depreciation rates by individual National
9 Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners category, as set forth in the Direct Testimony of
10 Dorothy Hains, DMH-1, Exhibit 6, and attached hereto as Exhibit A.

11 61. Staff noted that it received compliance status reports from ADEQ dated December 8,
12 2009, and January 6, 2010, indicating that both water systems are currently delivering water that
13 meets water quality standards required by A.A.C., Title 18, Chapter 4.

14 62. Valle Verde is located in the Santa Cruz Active Management Area ("AMA") and is
15 subject to AMA reporting and conservation rules. Staff received a compliance status report from the
16 Arizona Department of Water Resources ("ADWR") dated September 1, 2009, indicating ADWR has
17 determined that the Company is currently in compliance with departmental requirements governing
18 water providers and/or community water systems.

19 63. Staff stated that Valle Verde has no delinquent Commission compliance issues.

20 64. The Company has an approved curtailment tariff and an approved backflow
21 prevention tariff on file with the Commission.

22 65. Because an allowance for the property tax expense is included in Valle Verde's rates
23 and will be collected from its customers, the Commission seeks assurances from the Company that
24 any taxes collected from ratepayers have been remitted to the appropriate taxing authority. It has
25 come to the Commission's attention that a number of water companies have been unwilling or unable
26 to fulfill their obligation to pay the taxes that were collected from its ratepayers, some for as many as
27

28 ³⁶ Tr. at pages 120, 122-125.

twenty years. It is reasonable, therefore, that as a preventive measure the Company shall annually file, as part of its annual report, an affidavit with the Commission's Utilities Division attesting that the company is current in paying its property taxes in Arizona.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Valle Verde is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§40-250, 40-251, and 40-367.

2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Valle Verde and the subject matter contained in the Company's Rate Application and Finance Application.

3. Notice of the Rate Application and Finance Application was given in accordance with Arizona law.

4. The rates and charges established herein are just and reasonable and in the public interest.

5. The financing approved herein is for lawful purposes within Valle Verde's corporate powers, is compatible with the public interest, with sound financial practices, and with the proper performance by Valle Verde of service as a public service corporation, and will not impair its ability to perform the service.

6. The financing approved herein is for the purposes stated in the Finance Application and as stated herein is reasonably necessary for those purposes, and such purposes are not, wholly or in part, reasonably chargeable to operating expenses or to income.

7. The recommendations stated herein are reasonable and should be adopted.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water Company is hereby authorized and directed to file with the Commission, on or before October 29, 2010, revised schedules of rates and charges consistent with the discussion herein, as set forth below.

MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE:

5/8" x 3/4" Meter (All Classes)	\$18.00
3/4" Meter (All Classes)	18.00

1	1" Meter (All Classes)	43.00
1	1-1/2" Meter (All Classes)	86.00
2	2" Meter (All Classes)	138.00
2	3" Meter (All Classes)	275.00
3	4" Meter (All Classes)	429.00
3	6" Meter (All Classes)	857.00

COMMODITY CHARGES:**5/8-Inch Meter (Residential)**

6	0 to 3,000 Gallons	\$1.30
7	3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	2.90
8	Over 10,000 Gallons	4.25

3/4-Inch Meter (Residential)

9	0 to 3,000 Gallons	1.30
10	3,001 to 10,000 Gallons	2.90
11	Over 10,000 Gallons	4.25

5/8 x 3/4-Inch Meter (Commercial)

12	0 to 10,000 Gallons	2.90
13	Over 10,000 Gallons	4.25

3/4-Inch Meter (Commercial)

14	0 to 10,000 Gallons	2.90
15	Over 10,000 Gallons	4.25

1-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

16	0 to 15,000 Gallons	2.90
17	Over 15,000 Gallons	4.25

1 1/2-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

18	0 to 20,000 Gallons	2.90
19	Over 20,000 Gallons	4.25

2-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial, Res/Comm.)

20	0 to 25,000 Gallons	2.90
21	Over 25,000 Gallons	4.25

3-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

22	0 to 70,000 Gallons	2.90
23	Over 70,000 Gallons	4.25

4-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

24	0 to 150,000 Gallons	2.90
25	Over 150,000 Gallons	4.25

6-Inch Meter (Residential, Commercial)

0 to 500,000 Gallons	2.90
Over 500,000 Gallons	4.25

SERVICE LINE AND METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:

	<u>Service Line</u>	<u>Meter Installation</u>	<u>Total</u>
5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 445.00	\$ 155.00	\$ 600.00
3/4" Meter	445.00	255.00	700.00
1" Meter	495.00	315.00	810.00
1-1/2" Meter	550.00	525.00	1,075.00
2" Turbine Meter	830.00	1,045.00	1,875.00
2" Compound Meter	830.00	1,890.00	2,720.00
3" Turbine Meter	1,045.00	1,670.00	2,715.00
3" Compound Meter	1,165.00	2,545.00	3,710.00
4" Turbine Meter	1,490.00	1,737.00	3,227.00
4" Compound Meter	1,670.00	3,645.00	5,315.00
6" Turbine Meter	2,210.00	3,766.00	5,976.00
6" Compound Meter	2,330.00	6,920.00	9,250.00
Over 6"	Cost	Cost	Cost

SERVICE CHARGES:

Establishment	\$30.00
Establishment (After Hours)	40.00
Reconnection (Delinquent)	40.00
Reconnection (Delinquent and After Hours)	50.00
Meter Test (if correct)	35.00
Deposit	(a)
Deposit Interest	(a)
Re-Establishment (Within 12 Months)	(b)
NSF Check	\$25.00
Late Charge per month	1.50%
Deferred Payment, Per Month	1.50%
Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	20.00
Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler	(c)
(a) Per Commission Rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)	
(b) Number of months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission Rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D).	
(c) 2% of monthly minimum for a comparable sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.	

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the revised schedules of rates and charges shall be effective for all service rendered on and after November 1, 2010.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
2 Company shall implement a Temporary Surcharge of \$.60 per 1,000 gallons, as described herein.
3 The Temporary Surcharge shall become effective on November 1, 2010, and the Company shall
4 continue to assess the Temporary Surcharge until such time that all funds currently owed to the City
5 of Nogales for purchased water have been paid in full.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
7 Company shall file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, beginning December
8 31, 2010, quarterly statements indicating the beginning balance on the City of Nogales account, the
9 amount collected by the Temporary Surcharge during the quarter, the amount paid to the City of
10 Nogales during the quarter, and the balance at the end of the quarter. Such quarterly reports shall
11 continue to be filed until the account has been paid in full.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that upon payment of the funds owed to the City of Nogales,
13 the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water Company shall file with Docket Control, as
14 a compliance item in this docket, an affidavit indicating that the funds have been repaid and the
15 Temporary Surcharge has ceased, within 30 days of the cessation of the Temporary Surcharge.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
17 Company shall notify its customers of the revised schedules of rates and charges and Temporary
18 Surcharge authorized herein by means of an insert in its next regularly scheduled billing, or by
19 separate mailing, in a form acceptable to Staff.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
21 Company shall file as part of its Annual Report affidavits attesting that it is current on payment of its
22 property taxes in Arizona.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
24 Company shall use the Depreciation Table, attached hereto as Exhibit A, on a going forward basis.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
26 Company shall monitor the water loss for both systems and report the losses in its Annual Reports. If
27 the reported combined water loss is greater than 10 percent, the Company shall prepare a report
28 containing a detailed analysis and plan to reduce water loss to 10 percent or less. If the Company

1 believes it is not cost effective to reduce the water loss to less than 10 percent, it should submit a
2 detailed cost benefit analysis to support it opinion. In no case shall the Company allow water loss to
3 be greater than 15 percent.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
5 Company shall file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, no later than December
6 31, 2011, a copy of the Approval of Construction of the additional storage.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
8 Company is authorized to borrow up to \$1,278,238, from the Arizona Water Infrastructure Finance
9 Authority for a term of up to 22 years amortizing loan at a rate not to exceed the prime rate plus two
10 percent for an amount not to exceed \$1,278,238.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that such financing authority shall be expressly contingent upon
12 the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water Company's use of the proceeds for the
13 purposes stated and approved herein.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
15 Company may use the proceeds of its loan to repay a short-term loan from Southwest Utility
16 Management in an amount not to exceed \$25,000.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
18 Company is authorized to engage in any transactions and to execute any documents necessary to
19 effectuate the authorization granted herein.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
21 Company shall file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, copies of its executed
22 financing documents within 60 days after the transaction is closed.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that approval of the financing set forth hereinabove does not
24 constitute or imply approval or disapproval by the Commission of any particular expenditure of the
25 proceeds derived thereby for purposes of establishing just and reasonable rates.

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Estate of William F. Randall d/b/a Valle Verde Water
2 Company shall file a Finance Application with the Commission for approval of the truck loan in
3 accordance with A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302, no later than January 31, 2010.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this docket shall be held open until December 31, 2011.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

6 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.
7
8

9 CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER

10
11 COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

12
13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, ERNEST G. JOHNSON,
14 Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
15 have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
16 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
17 this _____ day of _____, 2010.

18
19 _____
20 ERNEST G. JOHNSON
21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

DISSENT _____

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SERVICE LIST FOR: THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM F. RANDALL
D/B/A VALLE VERDE WATER COMPANY

DOCKET NOS.: W-01431A-09-0360 and W-01431A-09-0361

Steve Wene
MOYES SELLERS & SIMS
1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Steven M. Olea, Director
Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

EXHIBIT "A"

Water Depreciation Rates (Valle Verde Water)

Acct. No.	Depreciable Plant	Average Service Life (Years)	Annual Accrual Rate (%)
304	Structures & Improvements	30	3.33
305	Collecting & Impounding Reservoirs	40	2.50
306	Lake, River, Canal Intakes	40	2.50
307	Wells & Springs	30	3.33
308	Infiltration Galleries	15	6.67
309	Raw Water Supply Mains	50	2.00
310	Power Generation Equipment	20	5.00
311	Pumping Equipment	8	12.5
320	Water Treatment Equipment		
320.1	Water Treatment Plants	30	3.33
320.2	Solution Chemical Feeders	5	20.0
320.4	Water Treatment Plant (media) - PCE removal plant	20	5.00
330	Distribution Reservoirs & Standpipes		
	Storage Tanks		
330.1	Pressure Tanks	45	2.22
330.2		20	5.00
331	Transmission & Distribution Mains	50	2.00
333	Services	30	3.33
334	Meters	12	8.33
335	Hydrants	50	2.00
336	Backflow Prevention Devices	15	6.67
339	Other Plant & Misc Equipment	15	6.67
340	Office Furniture & Equipment	15	6.67
340.1	Computers & Software	5	20.00
341	Transportation Equipment	5	20.00
342	Stores Equipment	25	4.00
343	Tools, Shop & Garage Equipment	20	5.00
344	Laboratory Equipment	10	10.00
345	Power Operated Equipment	20	5.00
346	Communication Equipment	10	10.00
347	Miscellaneous Equipment	10	10.00
348	Other Tangible Plant	----	----